UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,129	08/07/2006	Mathias Rausch	SC12838EM	7803

34814   7590   08/03/2011
LARSON NEWMAN, LLP
5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE
SUITE 200
AUSTIN, TX 78730

EXAMINER
BAIG, ADNAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2461	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/03/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ecox@LNAlaw.com
mtaylor@LNAlaw.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action _Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief_		10/565,129	RAUSCH ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		ADNAN BAIG	2461	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 June 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

      Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

      NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Huy D Vu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2461

/ADNAN BAIG/
Examiner, Art Unit 2461

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The teachings of Le Scolan (Of Record) in view of Przelomiec (Of Record), further in view of Sparell (Of record), and further in view of Kotaki (Of Record) when combined, arrive to the claimed limitaions. The applicant argues the time correction number N and the correction coefficient does not correspond to the "predetermined fixed step value" as claimed. The examiner respectfully disagrees as Kotaki (Of Record) discloses using the correction coefficient (e.g., D=0.1) for obtaining time synchronization between the master station and slave station after 10 system times where a smooth time correction can be accomplished in a step like time variation +- 0.1Delta T, (see Col. 4 lines 10-48). By determining the correction coefficient based on the algorithm defined in (Col. 3 lines 20-47), obtaining synchonization in a step like variation using the correction coefficient and N system times, is a "predetermined fixed step value". The teachings of Przelomiec (Of Record) in (Col. 6 lines 59-67), discloses determining, based on timing codes generated between two networks, whether synchronization is achieved based on the timing codes referenced to a prescribed tolerance (e.g., threshold). When the corrective action is perfomed in order to achieve synchronization, by adjusting the clocks in MSCs to duplicate the timing of the "master" network, a first fixed code value (e.g., timing code) will be generated by the "master" or determined based on the sign of the difference influenced by the corrective action. Sparell (Of Record) discloses communicating a master synchronization code to allow all slave devices to synchronize with the master clock of the master device, (see Col. 8 lines 25-38 & Col. 9 lines 31-34). It would be readily apparent to one of ordinary skill for transmitting the determined fixed code value to the second computer node when the network timing information between the first and second networks exceeds the threshold, as the master synchronization code of Sparell (Of record) is used for synchronization.